

8-1-1997

### Fish Species Composition and Associations in a Section of Morganfork Creek, Southwestern Mississippi

Mark D. Farr

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/sfcproceedings>



Part of the [Marine Biology Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Farr, Mark D. (1997) "Fish Species Composition and Associations in a Section of Morganfork Creek, Southwestern Mississippi," *Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings*: No. 35.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/sfcp35it8o>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/sfcproceedings/vol1/iss35/9>

This article is brought to you freely and openly by Volunteer, Open-access, Library-hosted Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/sfcproceedings>.

---

## Fish Species Composition and Associations in a Section of Morganfork Creek, Southwestern Mississippi

# Fish Species Composition and Associations in a Section of Morganfork Creek, Southwestern Mississippi

MARK D. FARR<sup>1</sup>

Department of Biology  
Northeast Louisiana University  
Monroe, Louisiana 71209-0520

## INTRODUCTION

Morganfork Creek is a small tributary of the Homochitto River, which drains a substantial portion of southwestern Mississippi (ca. 3108 km<sup>2</sup>, Newcome and Thomson, 1970). Ichthyological surveys of the Homochitto River drainage indicate a relatively diverse fish assemblage comprising approximately 105 species (Cook, 1959; Baker, 1984; Ebert et al., 1985). Cook (1959) and Baker (1984) provided information concerning species distributions within portions of the main channel of the Homochitto River. Ebert et al. (1985) incorporated records of fishes collected from tributaries to compile a more comprehensive list of species within the drainage. However, no quantitative data on fish assemblages within the drainage have been published. The purpose of this paper is to provide a species list and a brief description of fish assemblage composition within a section of Morganfork Creek; results are based on collections made over a six-year period (1989-1995).

## STUDY SITE AND METHODS

Morganfork Creek, a third-order stream, originates in southern Jefferson County, Mississippi, flows southward into Franklin County, and eventually drains into Middlefork Creek, near Meadville. I sampled fishes from a ca. 600 m section of stream 6.5 km north of Hwy 84 near Kirby. Habitat within the site was comprised of both erosional (riffle and run) and depositional (glide/transitional and pool) areas, although deep pools were uncommon. High flow events often resulted in the formation of large sand/gravel dunes and shifting of instream habitat. However, relative abundances of habitat types was generally consistent throughout the study period (M. Farr, *pers. obs.*). Possible sources of instream cover consisted of woody debris, root wads, undercut banks, and associated debris piles. Similar to many other streams within the drainage (Hartfield, 1993), Morganfork Creek has a wide channel (ca. 40 m) of sand and gravel, but wetted width at normal flow ranged from ca. 3-8 m. At normal flow, stream depth typically ranged from ca. 0.05-1.2 m.

Twenty-three collections of fishes were made from April 1989-October 1991 and August 1994-March 1995. All collections were made during normal flow periods (at least four days following the most recent rain event). All specimens were collected with a 3 m x 4.8 mm mesh seine, preserved in 10% formaldehyde, and later stored in 50% isopropyl alcohol. Voucher specimens for each species were deposited in the ichthyological collection at Northeast Louisiana University.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 8203 specimens representing 45 species in nine families was collected from Morganfork Creek (Table 1). Number of species present in individual collections ranged from 6-32. Erosional habitats and more depositional glide habitats were abundant, but pools were usually limited in number and size. Thus, species generally associated with pool habitats (sunfishes, poeciliids, atherinids) were collected less frequently than species typically associated with areas of higher flow (cyprinids and percids) (Tables 1 & 2).

Cyprinids were the most numerically dominant group in the assemblage (Table 2). Representatives of 14 cyprinid species comprised 82.9% of all specimens collected. Although ten species of darters were collected, they represented only 3.3% of all sampled individuals. Conversely, only three species of topminnows were collected, but they comprised 11.3% of all fishes collected. All other groups comprised only 2.5% of sampled fishes.

Overall relative abundances of species indicated that *Cyprinella camura*, the bluntface shiner, was the most common species (42.90%) in the Morganfork Creek assemblage (Table 1). *Cyprinella venusta* (blacktail shiner 14.66%), *Notropis longirostris* (longnose shiner 14.26%), and *Fundulus catenatus* (northern studfish 10.82%) were the only other species with relative abundances greater than 3.0%. Bluntface shiners were commonly collected in erosional habitats, whereas blacktail shiners, longnose shiners, and northern studfish were more generally distributed among habitat types. Warren et al. (1994) indicated that these same four species, along with *Hybognathus nuchalis* (Mississippi silvery minnow), were the most abundant taxa at low-order sites in the Buffalo River, another tributary of the Mississippi River that drains a portion of southwestern Mississippi.

<sup>1</sup>Present Address: School of Forest Resources, University of Georgia, Athens GA 30602. Email: loticsci@negia.net

Table 1. Species, number of specimens (No.), overall relative abundance (ORA), and percent occurrence in all samples (PO) of fishes collected from Morganfork Creek.

| Family       | Species                        | No.  | ORA   | PO    | Family          | Species                        | No. | ORA   | PO    |
|--------------|--------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|--------------------------------|-----|-------|-------|
| Clupeidae    |                                |      |       |       | Cyprinodontidae |                                |     |       |       |
|              | <i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>     | 2    | 0.02  | 4.3   |                 | <i>Fundulus catenatus</i>      | 886 | 10.82 | 100.0 |
| Cyprinidae   |                                |      |       |       |                 | <i>Fundulus notatus</i>        | 23  | 0.28  | 30.4  |
|              | <i>Cyprinella camura</i>       | 3511 | 42.90 | 100.0 |                 | <i>Fundulus olivaceus</i>      | 15  | 0.18  | 26.1  |
|              | <i>Cyprinella lutrensis</i>    | 108  | 1.32  | 60.9  | Poeciliidae     |                                |     |       |       |
|              | <i>Cyprinella venusta</i>      | 1200 | 14.66 | 100.0 |                 | <i>Gambusia affinis</i>        | 14  | 0.17  | 13.0  |
|              | <i>Hybognathus nuchalis</i>    | 217  | 2.65  | 43.5  | Atherinidae     |                                |     |       |       |
|              | <i>Hybopsis wincheli</i>       | 12   | 0.15  | 17.4  |                 | <i>Labidesthes sicculus</i>    | 24  | 0.29  | 30.4  |
|              | <i>Luxilus chrysocephalus</i>  | 243  | 2.97  | 73.9  | Centrarchidae   |                                |     |       |       |
|              | <i>Lythrurus fumeus</i>        | 1    | 0.01  | 4.3   |                 | <i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>       | 2   | 0.02  | 8.7   |
|              | <i>Lythrurus umbratilis</i>    | 17   | 0.21  | 17.4  |                 | <i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>     | 71  | 0.87  | 52.2  |
|              | <i>Nocomis leptcephalus</i>    | 187  | 2.28  | 73.9  |                 | <i>Lepomis megalotis</i>       | 39  | 0.48  | 39.1  |
|              | <i>Notemigonus crysoleucas</i> | 3    | 0.04  | 4.3   |                 | <i>Lepomis microlophus</i>     | 1   | 0.01  | 4.3   |
|              | <i>Notropis longirostris</i>   | 1185 | 14.45 | 100.0 |                 | <i>Micropterus punctulatus</i> | 4   | 0.05  | 13.0  |
|              | <i>Pimephales notatus</i>      | 81   | 0.99  | 56.5  |                 | <i>Micropterus salmoides</i>   | 5   | 0.06  | 8.7   |
|              | <i>Pimephales vigilax</i>      | 35   | 0.43  | 34.8  | Percidae        |                                |     |       |       |
|              | <i>Semotilus atromaculatus</i> | 4    | 0.05  | 13.0  |                 | <i>Ammocrypta beani</i>        | 1   | 0.01  | 4.3   |
| Catostomidae |                                |      |       |       |                 | <i>Etheostoma asprigene</i>    | 1   | 0.01  | 4.3   |
|              | <i>Erimyzon oblongus</i>       | 5    | 0.06  | 8.7   |                 | <i>Etheostoma caeruleum</i>    | 93  | 1.14  | 69.6  |
|              | <i>Hypentelium nigricans</i>   | 13   | 0.16  | 26.1  |                 | <i>Etheostoma chlorosomum</i>  | 1   | 0.01  | 4.3   |
|              | <i>Moxostoma poecilurum</i>    | 2    | 0.02  | 8.7   |                 | <i>Etheostoma lynceum</i>      | 13  | 0.16  | 30.4  |
| Ictaluridae  |                                |      |       |       |                 | <i>Etheostoma parvipinne</i>   | 5   | 0.06  | 4.3   |
|              | <i>Ameiurus natalis</i>        | 6    | 0.07  | 8.7   |                 | <i>Etheostoma swaini</i>       | 5   | 0.06  | 4.3   |
|              | <i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>     | 2    | 0.02  | 4.3   |                 | <i>Etheostoma whipplei</i>     | 50  | 0.61  | 52.2  |
|              | <i>Noturus hildebrandi</i>     | 2    | 0.02  | 8.7   |                 | <i>Percina sciera</i>          | 52  | 0.64  | 47.8  |
|              | <i>Noturus miurus</i>          | 12   | 0.15  | 21.7  |                 | <i>Percina vigil</i>           | 47  | 0.57  | 30.4  |
|              | <i>Noturus nocturnus</i>       | 2    | 0.02  | 8.7   |                 |                                |     |       |       |
|              | <i>Noturus phaeus</i>          | 1    | 0.01  | 4.3   |                 |                                |     |       |       |

Table 2. Number of species (No. spp.), number of individuals (No. ind.), and overall relative abundance (ORA) of common families collected from Morganfork Creek.

|            | No. spp. | No. ind. | ORA  |
|------------|----------|----------|------|
| Cyprinids  | 14       | 6804     | 82.9 |
| Topminnows | 3        | 924      | 11.3 |
| Darters    | 10       | 268      | 3.3  |
| Sunfishes  | 6        | 122      | 1.5  |
| Catfishes  | 6        | 25       | 0.3  |
| Suckers    | 3        | 20       | 0.2  |
| Others     | 3        | 40       | 0.5  |
| Total      | 45       | 8203     |      |

Bluntnose shiners, blacktail shiners, longnose shiners, and northern studfish were the only taxa present in all 23 Morganfork Creek collections (100 percent occurrence; Table 1). Among the other taxa, percent occurrence exceeded 30% for 15 species and 40% for nine species. Despite the relatively large number of species collected from Morganfork Creek, 11 species were collected only once, and seven species were only present in two collections. These results are probably reflective of temporal variability in both collection effort and the distributional patterns of less common species.

The most common sucker in Morganfork Creek was *Hypentelium nigricans* (northern hogsucker 0.16%) (Table 1). Although most northern hogsuckers were collected in erosional habitats, a large school of approximately 30-40 individuals was observed during summer 1993 foraging for over an hour along the bottom of a shallow pool. *Noturus miurus* (brindled madtom 0.15%) was the most abundant madtom; like other

madtom species, it was usually associated with submerged banks and debris piles. *Lepomis macrochirus* (bluegill 0.87%) and *L. megalotis* (longear sunfish 0.48%) were primarily collected in pools or eddies behind submerged debris. *Etheostoma caeruleum* (rainbow darter 1.14%), *E. whipplei* (redfin darter 0.61%), *Percina sciera* (dusky darter 0.64%), and *P. vigil* (saddleback darter 0.57%) were the most common percids. All four species were collected in erosional habitats, but only rainbow darters were consistently taken over open gravel. Other percids were often associated with small debris piles.

Morganfork Creek has a rich fish assemblage, although many species were only collected once or twice from 1989-1994. Other authors have addressed the complex distributional patterns of fishes in major drainages of southwestern Mississippi and the Florida Parishes of Louisiana (e.g. Guillory and Conner, 1973; Suttkus and Clemmer, 1977; Guillory, 1978; Bart and Cashner, 1980; Conner and Suttkus, 1986). Suttkus and Clemmer (1977) and Hartfield (1993) discussed the potential negative effects of habitat degradation within regional tributaries of the Mississippi River. There are many potential sources of stream degradation within the Homochitto River drainage (e.g. timber harvesting, agricultural practices, gravel mining, road construction, recreational and residential development, drilling and maintenance of oil wells, etc.). For this reason, more quantitative descriptions of local fish assemblages are needed. Data from such studies might prove valuable if evaluating or monitoring distributions of ecologically sensitive species becomes necessary in the future.

## LITERATURE CITED

- Baker, J.A. 1984. Southwest Mississippi tributaries study area environmental inventory of aquatic resources. Unpublished Report of the Aquatic Habitat Group, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi. 34 pp.
- Bart, H.L. and R.C. Cashner. 1980. New records for the northern studfish, *Fundulus catenatus*, in the lower Mississippi and Gulf coastal drainages. Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings 3:1-4.
- Conner, J.V. and R.D. Suttkus. 1986. Zoogeography of freshwater fishes of the western gulf slope, p. 413-456. In: Zoogeography of North American Freshwater Fishes. C.H. Hocutt and E.O. Wiley (eds.). John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Cook, F.A. 1959. Freshwater fishes in Mississippi. Mississippi Game and Fish Commission, Jackson.
- Ebert, D.J., R.M. Weill and P.D. Hartfield. 1985. A checklist of fishes in the Homochitto River system. Journal of the Mississippi Academy of Sciences 30:103-110.
- Guillory, V. 1978. New interpretations of fish dispersal via the lower Mississippi River. Florida Scientist 41:96-100.
- Guillory, V. and J.V. Conner. 1973. Fishes of Thompson Creek in the Feliciana Parishes of Louisiana and southwestern Mississippi. ASB Bulletin 20:31.
- Hartfield, P. 1993. Headcuts and their effects on freshwater mussels, pp. 131-141. In: Conservation and management of freshwater mussels. Proceedings of a Upper Mississippi River Conservation Committee symposium. K.S. Cummings, A.C. Buchanan, and L.M. Koch (eds.). Rock Island, Illinois. 189pp.
- Newcome, R. Jr. and F.H. Thomson. 1970. Water for industrial development in Amite, Franklin, Lincoln, Pike and Wilkinson counties, Mississippi. U.S. Geological Survey and Mississippi Research and Development Center. 44 pp.
- Suttkus, R.D. and G.H. Clemmer. 1977. A status report on the bayou darter, *Etheostoma rubrum*, and the Bayou Pierre system. Southeastern Fishes Council Proceedings 1:1-2.
- Warren, M.A., R.C. Cashner and R.D. Suttkus. 1994. Fishes of the Buffalo River system, Wilkinson County, southwestern Mississippi. Tulane Studies in Zoology and Botany 29:127-139.